REMARKS

These remarks are in response to the Final Office Action dated May 17, 2005 and a telephone conversation with Examiner Chen on July 21 and July 22, 2005. Claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-29 have been rejected. Claims 2-10, 12-20, and 22-29 are pending. Claims 3-6, 13-16 and 23-25 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 2, 12 and 22 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 3-6, 13-16 and 23-25 respectively without prejudice. Examiner has indicated that by providing these amendments, claims 2, 12 and 22 are in allowable form. Claims 7 and 17 have been amended to clarify dependencies. Accordingly, Applicants do not concede that original claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-29 are not patentable and reserve the right to file a continuation application containing such claims should the Applicants desire. Nonetheless, Applicants respectfully submits that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 7-10, 12, 17-20, 22 and 26-29 remain pending.

This application is under final rejection. Applicants have presented arguments below that Applicants believe should render the claims allowable. In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicants' arguments, Applicants respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the arguments to clarify issues upon appeal.

Double Patenting

The Examiner has stated:

> **Claims 2, 12 and 22 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,747 and claims 1, 5-6 of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,707. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentable distinct from each other because:**
>
> **Claims 2, 12 and 22 of the present application merely repeat the features of claims 1-3 of US Patent No. 6,654,747 and claims 1, 5-6 of U.S. Patent No. 5,966,707 with fewer limitations. However, it is obvious for an ordinary skilled person in the art at the time the invention was made to remove limitations from the claims for the**

purpose to extend a more broader intentional usage for his/hers invention.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed on 2/14/2005, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. The prior art rejection of claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-29 has been withdrawn. However, the claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-29 will not be allowed until a registered attorney or agent of record signs terminal disclaimers that are fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b) to overcome the double patenting rejection as cited above.

Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments and Terminal Disclaimer place the application in condition for allowance based upon the Applicants' attorney discussion with the Examiner. In response, Applicants have included a Terminal Disclaimer.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 2, 7-10, 12, 17-20, 22 and 26-29 are patentable over the cited references. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claims as now presented.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

July 22, 2005
Date

Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 30,801
(650) 493-4540